

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0166619 A1, hereinafter “Roberts”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites “an expected sequence field, the expected sequence field to contain a first sequence of unscrambled values ... and a synchronization field following the expected sequence field, the synchronization field to contain a second sequence of values scrambled by a scrambler.” The Office action states that Roberts teaches a synchronization field following an expected sequence field and refers to element 1820 in Figure 18 of Roberts, as well as paragraphs [0275-0276] of Roberts. Office Action, page 2. Roberts, however, does not teach or suggest a synchronization field following an expected sequence field. To the contrary, element 1820 is a header that “includes information about the intended recipient of the packet.” Roberts, paragraph [0275]. In Roberts, synchronization clearly occurs in the preamble 1810 because “[n]o substantive data is sent in the preamble 1820 since the receiver 1520 is still getting its timing synchronized with that of the transmitter 1510.” Id. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Claims 2-17 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claims 18, 22-23, and 26-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Carsello (U.S. Patent No. 7,106,814 B2, hereinafter "Carsello"). Also, claims 19-21 and 24-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carsello, in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0101068 A1, hereinafter "Wang"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 18 recites "using analog circuits to match samples of the detected signals with a copy of the expected sequence, wherein the expected sequence is transmitted as part of the preamble." Carsello does not teach or suggest using analog circuits to match samples of the detected signals with a copy of the expected sequence. The Office Action identifies element 324 in Figure 3 of Carsello as the analog circuit used to match the samples. Office Action, page 5. Element 324, on the contrary, is clearly identified as a mixer used to downconvert the received signal. Carsello, col. 8, lines 11-26. Furthermore, the preamble detector 308 shown in Figure 3 of Carsello is shown to be coupled to the outputs of analog-to-digital converters 350 and 352, and Carsello even states that "[t]he analog-to-digital converters produce I and Q outputs that are *digital signals* and that are coupled or sent to the preamble detector 308." Carsello, col. 8, lines 46-48 (emphasis added). Not only does Carsello not teach or suggest using analog circuits to match samples, Carsello teaches away from doing so by stating that preamble detector 308 uses digital signals. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 18 is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Similarly, claim 23 recites "using analog circuits to match samples of the detected signals with a copy of the expected sequence, wherein the expected sequence is transmitted as part of the preamble." As discussed herein above with respect to claim 18, Carsello does not teach or suggest using analog circuits to match samples of the detected signals. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 23 is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Claims 19-22 depend from claim 18 and add further limitations, and claims 24-27 depend from claim 23 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Steven Shaw, Applicants' attorney, at 972-917-5137 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

February 19, 2007

Brian A. Carlson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,793

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218